DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 986 HE 013 178

AUTHOR Burnett, Lewie
TITLE External Degrees: The Problem and a Resolution. A Resolution is Adopted. ACSA Special Report, Vol. 9, No. 6, June 1980.
INSTITUTION Association of California School Administrators.
PUB DATE Jun 80
NOTE 10p.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); Administrator Education; Agency Cooperation; *Educational Quality; *External Degree Programs; Higher Education; Position Papers; Professional Development; Public Education; *Quality Control; State Departments of Education; State Legislation; *State Standards; *Teacher Improvement
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

A resolution is presented that was approved in the 1978-79 school year by six California professional associations in education, and which has been referred to the state education department and relevant accreditation associations. The issue is the accreditation and quality control of external degree programs. It is resolved that: (1) administrators, teachers, and students pursuing external degree programs select them from accredited institutions; (2) teachers' associations, administrators' associations, and higher education institutions urge the appropriate agencies to apply rigorous reviews in their approval procedures; (3) the authorities give special attention to procedures and standards to guarantee the quality of emerging institutions; (4) all groups join forces in the development of state legislation for control of offerings of private brokers and out-of-state institutions in California; and (5) all California school districts be urged to adopt clearly understood guidelines for professional growth increments resulting from external programs. The background leading to the resolution, and an explanation of proposed solutions, are provided. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193986

A C S A SPECIAL REPORT

Volume 9, No. 6 June 1980

EXTERNAL DEGREES: THE PROBLEM AND A RESOLUTION

A Resolution is Adopted

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Assn of Calif
Deborah Adessi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 013 178

ACSA SPECIAL REPORT

To: HE

by ACSA Higher Education/Professional Preparation Committee

Lewie Burnett, Author

Vol. 9, No. 6
June, 1980

Revised March 25, 1980

EXTERNAL DEGREES: THE PROBLEM AND A RESOLUTION

A Resolution is Adopted

WHEREAS outreach programs such as those leading to external degrees can provide viable options for the professional growth of school personnel, and

WHEREAS the differing needs and learning styles of school personnel call for variety in the experiences for professional growth, and

WHEREAS collaboration by school districts, professional associations and institutions of higher education increase the likelihood of relevant and appreciated growth experiences, and such collaborative efforts are to be encouraged, but

WHEREAS there is a growing proliferation of programs in California - some traditional and some non-traditional - and offered not only be established and accredited institutions in the State but by out-of-state institutions, emerging institutions and private brokers, and

WHEREAS there is a growing concern about the quality of some offerings and the monitoring of standards, so

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that administrators, teachers and students desiring to pursue external degree programs be encouraged to select external programs from higher education institutions which themselves have been accredited by associations approved by H.E.W.* such as W.A.S.C.** and

THAT the teachers associations, the administrators associations and the institutions of higher education urge the accrediting commissions, state agencies and post-secondary education commissions to apply rigorous reviews and high standards in their approval procedures for both campus and external degree programs, and

THAT a strong appeal go to the accrediting commissions, state agencies and post-secondary education commissions to give special attention to the procedures and standards necessary to guarantee the quality of programs offered by the emerging, not-yet-fully-accredited institutions, and

THAT all groups join forces in the development of legislation to impose some form of reasonable controls over the offerings in California of private brokers and out-of-state institutions, and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that all school districts in California be urged to adopt clearly understood guidelines for professional growth increments resulting from external programs.

*H.E.W. (Health, Education and Welfare)
**W.A.S.C. (Western Association of Schools and Colleges)

ACSA: 1575 Old Bayshore Highway, Burlingame CA 94010 (415) 692-4300

SPECIAL REPORT is published by the ASSOCIATION OF CALIFORNIA SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS

During the 1978-79 school year, the above Resolution or its equivalent was approved by the executive boards and/or state assemblies of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), the California Teachers Association (CTA), the California Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (CACTE), the California Federation of Teachers (CFT), the California Council on the Education of Teachers (CCET), and the California School Boards Association (CSBA). The six organizations are now in the process of calling it to the attention of their memberships.

The Resolution has been referred to the Office of Private Postsecondary Education, State Department of Education (OPPE) and the regional and national agencies for external assessment and accreditation: the California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing (CTPL), the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASC), and the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE). The support of these agencies and commissions has been promised.

The Problem in Review

External degrees in education refer to programs offered away from the campuses by the institutions of higher education (IHEs) to assist school personnel in professional growth experiences. Offerings may consist of individual courses, workshops or projects but also may include planned packages which qualify participants for graduate degrees. Such programs have multiplied in recent years for the convenience of school personnel and as a response to the needs in local schools. They have demonstrated considerable potential for the development of individuals and site programs.

At the same time, some external degree programs have led to growing concerns about their quality and value. Increasingly, questions have been raised. Were the off-campus offerings equivalent to those available on campus? How were standards established and results evaluated? Who plans and controls the offerings? Why are many teachers and administrators expressing dissatisfaction about the experiences and the results? How did all of those out-of-state institutions get into California with their programs? Who are these new California institutions and private brokers who suddenly emerged to promote external degrees? These are but a few of the questions that have been asked.

External degree programs are being offered by established and accredited institutions, by emerging and non-accredited institutions, by private brokers, by out-of-state institutions, and by consortia or combinations of these groupings. Some of the programs are identical to the ones offered on campus; others are quite different. Some are planned with local associations and school districts; others are announced by the IHEs. Some have been reviewed for assessment or accreditation purposes by the CTPL, WASC and/or NCATE; others have not. Individual extension courses and workshops often are scheduled by the offices of continuing education from the IHEs without review and approval by the schools and departments of education (SDEs)on the campuses. The private brokers operate quite independently for service and profit, often alone but sometimes in cooperation with IHEs.

There is no law or mandate that requires the IHEs to be accredited before presenting off-campus programs, no requirement that off-campus courses and programs be similar to the ones on campus, no widely accepted standards for judging the quality of off-campus offerings, and no organized and systematic plan for resolving the growing issue. Free enterprise has been the standard with the hope that professional integrity will prevail and the assumption that the good programs will prosper and the poor ones will fail.

When complaints are registered or problems unfold, the lack of legal controls and statewide coordination makes it impossible for the individual commissions and agencies to get on top of the situation. The magnitude of the off-campus programs is almost overwhelming. Seventy (70) California IHEs offer basic credential programs on their campuses and most of them offer lacal service programs at sites and centers away from their campuses. In addition, as many as 25 IHEs from other states are into California each year with external degree programs, at least 12-15 private brokers offer services regularly, and 20 or more California IHEs defer programs in other states and abroad as well. No California agency or commission is authorized to evaluate and assess the quality of programs offered in the state by the IHEs from other states or by the private brokers in California.

Concerns have been expressed from a variety of sources: teachers because some programs exacted too much time, energy and dollars for the value received; administrators because some IHEs seemed to be lowering requirements for degrees; some IHEs because other IHEs were invading home territories with sub-standard programs; and school boards because rumor had it that personnel were qualifying for salary raises by the completion of nothing but token programs. These concerns have been fanned by press and television releases decrying diploma mills and cheap degrees.

The Resolution restated here resulted from a study made by a volunteer group of administrators, teachers and professors representing ACSA, the CTA and CACTE. The study exposed a dilemma. On the one hand, external degree programs opened the door to professional growth opportunities that could not be matched by the separation of campus and district offerings. On the other hand, some programs were widely criticized because of questionable quality. It became clear that no solution was possible from the efforts of any single group; earnest collaboration would be needed from all professional associations and accreditation agencies, the IHEs, the local school districts and the State. Thus, the Resolution was drafted to advocate guidelines for cooperative action.

Practices Prompting Second Thoughts

Inservice education and professional development programs are necessary and integral parts of school operation. They are both wanted and promoted. When attached to university credit and off-campus locales, they are frequently identified as external degree programs. When clients express satisfaction, they are hailed for the special contributions made. When there is client grumbling and unrest, they are criticized by such terms as "diploma mills" and "cheap credit."

Any practice that is new and different is easily misunderstood and is subject to question. Many inservice activities have been innovative in order to meet the emerging needs of school personnel. Diversity is recognized as an asset when it is successful. Mediocre or negligible results, however, will taint the reputation of of the innovative practice.

Some of the new practices have not fared well and have raised serious questions. Several examples follow. One is the obvious hustle by some IHEs for students. Dropping enrollments and economic survival have tempted some to change requitements in order to attract and hold more students. This effort, in some cases, has led to persuasive advertising, to the appointment of hard-sell extension officers, to the granting of generous amounts of transfer credit or credit for previous experience (for a fee), to cooperative contracts with private brokers for university credit, for the extension offices to operate independently of any controls by the SDEs. As an IHE resorts to any one or several of these bail-out-measures, it may enjoy temporary financial relief but there is bound to be some long-term problems. Unfortunately, too, such behavior casts a cloud over the potential role of all IHEs in off-campus activities.

The academic requirements of off-campus courses are often questionable. One example is the lecture course where ten or twelve local educators, often fellow teachers but seldom professors from the IHE, give two-hour lectures or demonstrations for small honorariums. Enrollees are given no outside assignments, readings or examinations. They may be asked to write short critiques of one or two lectures but grades are given primarily for attendance. Often a local teacher serves as coordinator for the IHE, responsible only for collecting the registration fees, introducing the speakers, and filing the attendance reports. The IHE pays the coordinator a head fee for each enrollee but no professor from the IHE attends or supervises the sessions.

Another practice that has been questioned is sometimes called "the weekender." Credit is granted for one-day workshops on Saturday, weekend field trips, or attendance at professional conferences. Those who enroll listen to speakers or participate in workshops but are not required to do any other preparation or study. Questions also have been raised about the quality of new IHEs that try to operate without libraries and other basic resources, about programs that erase large portions of degree requirements by substituting previous work experience, about IHEs that rely upon adjunct faculty rather than regular professors to carry the external degree programs, about programs that approve on-the-job assignments, which are largely unsupervised and which constitute the major part of degree requirements and about IHEs that approve degrees for little more than examinations or individual study.

The point is that these practices off-campus are being questioned with increasing frequency. Too many educators doubt that some of the innovative schemes are comparable in quality to the more traditional plans for these new practices to continue unchallenged. There has been a need for standards and processes to judge the worth of these new unorthodox programs. Such standards and processes should be as rigorous as they used to assess traditional programs.

The Dilemma at Hand

Assessing the quality of external degree programs will be no easy task. The tradit-

ional and the accepted have not been all good; the non-traditional and the new have not been all questionable. Examples of effectiveness and failures have stemmed from both types. Qualitative decisions may take more determination and skill than heretofore has been evidenced. It may be helpful to identify the sources of the dilemma and the unique problems.

First, the established and accredited IHEs contribute to the problem when they permit extension classes and off-campus centers to function without controls from the campus. It can be a mistake to assume that the courses and programs offered off-campus equate to those offered on campus. A reputable IHE in Ohio or Southern California can be surprised to learn that its offerings in Northern California are not viewed with much respect by the participants. The IHEs that stay within their immediate service region are more likely to be guided by the constant feedback of the local schools and associations.

Second, the private brokers and the emerging IHEs can contribute problems when they make excessive claims and promises in order to attract students. Minimum resources, including limitations of faculty, sometimes leads to the lowering of expectations amd a failure to deliver adequately. Credit received by those students who paid the bill does not always offset the disappointment in the educational experience.

A third source of potential problems can come from the accreditation processes. Until recent, it was not customary for WASC or the CTPL to review external degree programs. If the campus programs were apporved by the CTPL, and institution generally by WASC, there was assumption that the IHE and all of its offering were accredited. Indeed, the IHE commonly advertised its accreditation status, regardless of any shifts in quality of purpose for its external degree programs. For the field coordinator of a lecture course off-campus to announce to potential enrollees that the sponsoring IHE was accredited, did not mean that the schools and departments of education back on campus was aware of the nature of the course.

Furthermore, an emerging IHE, offering only external graduate degrees and no basic credential or undergraduate programs, would not come under review by the CTPL and it might function for several years before asking to be accredited by WASC. Even though new and unproven, it can offer programs with only limited guidance from the OPPE.

An added complication is the lack of any mandatory national accreditation; only regional accreditation prevails and it is not always mandatory. The IHE from Ohio can be approved by the North Central Association for programs in the Midwest but, if it wants to offer external degree programs in California, it is free to do so without strict review by either WASC or North Central. The reciprocity agreement among the six regional accreditation as ociations generally has left basic determination to the home region.

Possibly the fourth source of problems contributes as much discomfort. That problem simply stated, admits that standards and guidelines for assessing the quality of external degree programs have been slow in evolving. It has been difficult to rank programs from strong to weak, especially since there has been a push on experienced ones to innovate and the new ones have not been pushed very hard to justify themselves. Outstanding programs have flourished and dismal ones have diappeared without any plan or pattern. State restrictions against diploma mills have been loose, the IHEs generally have chosen not to police each other, organized professional development programs have been spotty, and many school districts have accepted the situation. Clients in poor programs seldom have registered official complaint. After all, they paid their money and took their chances. And they did receive credits, degrees and salary increases. Also, without clearly acceptable guidelines, who is to say that a new university without walls necessarily is a diploma mill or that good old State U. never offers a bummer?

What Has Been Done About the Question

Growing concerns about external degree programs have resulted in a number of corrective steps, especially within the last two or three years. The Resolution, cited earlier, is one example. It now is being referred to school districts, school boards and teachers associations for appropiate action. The top administrators of the IHEs have had it called to their attention, as have the individual members of all six sponsoring associations.

Much before this, however, many sections of the State had policies to guide the approval and handling of external degrees, the acceptance of extension courses for salary adjustments, and the planning and operation of professional development activities. Many school districts had developed such policies. Sometimes there had been county-wide coordination or leadership from teachers centers, ACSA regions

or professional negotiations. Consortia of IHEs have developed regulations covering standards and procedures for credit courses offered off-campus.

The external degree proliferation has been recognized as a statewide problem. WASC recently sponsored two study groups: One on contractual arrangements between IHEs and non-accredited organizations and the other on policies and procedures for better quality controls of off-campus programs. One result has been the use of people on evaluation teams who have been trained to look into these special programs. Another recent development, by both WASC and the CTPL, is the scheduling of visitation teams for separate reviews of programs offered at off-campus centers.

A significant move was made by WASC in 1978 when it adopted a new set of regulations to cover all programs and courses offered off-campus. These policies hold the IHEs accountable for both degree and non-degree credit courses. Resources, faculty, levels of instruction and evaluation, student services, and assignment of credit now must be commensurate with those on campus. Any alternatives must be justified. The IHE is held fully responsible for the quality of any programs offered under contractual relations with non-accredited agencies or organizations. WASC has one committee that is studying ways of evaluating non-traditional programs. Another WASC committee is developing a policy statement to cover practices in granting credit for prior learning experiences.

Recognition of the evolving concerns also has been expressed in Sacramento by the OPPE and the CPEC (California Postsecondary Education Commission). The CPEC, under direction of the Legislature, is now surveying extended education programs in California and will report back to the Assembly Ways and Means Committee sometime in 1980. The goal of the preliminary data-gathering phase is to determine costs to the State, accessibility of programs to students, cooperative and duplicative efforts of public and independent IHEs, and ability of WASC, the State and the IHEs to maintain quality. This study by CPEC is a part of its continuing review of life-long learning and five-year plans for postsecondary education.

In 1978, the CTPL made it clear to all IHEs that it was equally interested in programs offered at satellite centers. The CTPL has begun to send external assessment teams to review the programs offered at the off-campus sites. WASC also is moving out on external degree programs, now sening accrediting teams to cover programs offered by California IHEs in other states and overseas.

Where the regional accrediting agencies once tended to be somewhat protective about their IHEs, they now are fully supportive of each other and cooperative in the review of IHEs that cross state lines.

The OPPE is responsible for reviewing the programs of the emerging institutions in California under the "private Postsecondary Education Act of 1977" (Chapter 3, Part 59, Division 10, California Education Code). Prior to that Act, a new IHE could begin operations with little more than an administrative officer and property valued at $50,000. Such an application can still receive a favorable response from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction but now he has the authority to use a visiting team and check out the accuracy of the application and the potential of the applicant for providing professional programs. The OPPE handles these assignments and now uses a new set of standards for that purpose.

At this point it might be helpful for readers to list the steps of a new IHE from first application to official accreditation. The initial request goes to the State Superintendent. It includes descriptions of institutional objectives, methods of instruction, faculty, facilities, fees, admission and graduation requirements, and degrees or diplomas to be conferred. The Superintendent, after review, then may deny or may grant an authorization to operate for one year. This authorization may be renewed for three-year periods but it does no include permission to grant degrees or diplomas.

The second step, ordinarily within a year or two after first application, is for the IHE to seek approval to issue degrees. This request also goes to the State Superintendent who refers it to the OPPE for study. Approval is granted if evidence supports the conclusion that the IHE has adequate resources, facilities, faculty, administrators, records and student management procedures to satisfy the objectives of the proposed degree and diploma programs.

The third step for the IHE is to apply for accreditation to the regional agency recognized by the United States Office of Education for that purpose, e.g., WASC in California. WASC classifies the applicant as a "Candidate for Accreditation" for two years, subject to renewal. This constitutes an affiliation status with WASC that involves self-study by the IHE and on-site visitations from WASC. It is no guarantee of eventual accreditation by WASC. When WASC and the IHE agree that

readiness for official decision has developed, a trained team reviews the self-study reports and the IHE at the site. Accreditation by WASC is accepted by the State Superintendent and by approval authorities in other states as evidence that the IHE is in compliance with standards set for institutions and professional programs. The IHE then may apply for national accreditation through NCATE. However, this is optional in California and many of its IHEs have never done so.

It should be noted that an IHE in California may be in any one of four classifications: authorized to operate, approved to offer programs, candidacy for accreditation, or full accreditation. Note also how easy it is to confuse the terms: authorized, approved and accredited. Some of the emerging IHEs have capitalized upon this confusion by using the terms as if they were synonymous, or by making the general statement that they are "licensed by the State." And note, still further, that permission granted in previous years under any one of the four categories so often has referred primarily to programs offered on campus. It may or may not have covered off-campus programs.

Concerns about external degree programs are not peculiar to California; they are nationwide. This has become a national issue as education personnel move credits from state to state, as some IHEs open centers in several states, as regional accrediting associations experience difficulty in assessing the non-traditional and diverse offerings, and as some of the new IHEs attempt to establish their own accrediting body. The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) recently adopted a resolution in support of national accreditation as the means for quality control for all IHEs and education personnel development programs.

COPA, the national Council on Postsecondary Accreditation, with responsibility for approving the various accreditation agencies, is insisting upon both diversity and quality. It sees the need for reassuring the public about the quality of each IHE. COPA recently completed a national study on external degrees which concluded that not-traditional programs should be a part of the mainstream without need for new and special evaluative criteria. COPA, to date, has stopped the efforts of some emerging IHEs to form their own accrediting agency such as the National Association of Private Non-traditional Schools and Colleges (NAPNSC). Several of the members of the NAPNSC are new IHEs in Southern California.

NCATE laments the fact that there are many IHEs offering professional programs nationally that do not even hold regional accreditation. It would appear that COPA should be more sensitive to the NCATE position in this regard.

There have been other moves afoot. The National Education Association (NEA) is supporting stronger accreditation standards, especially at the national level, and is urging local teachers associations to include accreditation as a part of the negotiated contracts. Increasing numbers of school districts in some states now consider only graduates of IHEs accredited by NCATE for education assignments. This is true, too, of some states that now honor reciprocity only when candidates have completed degrees form NCATE-approved IHEs. The American Association of School Administrators (AASA) has deplored the movement toward easy degrees and has taken a position in support of school districts accepting only units completed from accredited IHEs. The National School Boards Association (NSBA) and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), while not as yet adopting official positions, have expressed serious concern about some of the emerging external degree practices and are reported to be working on the problem. The CTPL is now considering proposals for collaboration with NCATE that might streamline and strengthen the actions of both agencies in California.

What Else Can Be Done

The IHEs can get their houses in order by coupling drives for students with commitments for the maintenance of quality. Those that have not done so can review their external programs with the goal of applying standards similar to the ones on campus. Non-accredited IHEs can expect more rigorous scrutiny of their offerings by the professional associations and the local districts. The OPPE, the CTPL and WASC can become even more discerning and determined about the application of their new standards. Associations for the IHEs, such as CACTE and the CCET, can bring pressure to bear upon the established institutions which have been guilty of loose practices. Also, teachers and other potential students can become more discriminating and critical of shoddy programs and cheap credit.

One can anticipate certain events to occur in the immediate future concerning external degrees. These will include movements supporting national accreditation, the increasing tendency of major school systems to consider only those applicants who have completed programs from IHEs accredited by NCATE and/or the official regional agency, the demand by professional associations for recognizable and acceptable

standards of quality, the insistence in bargaining sessions for external programs that provide substance and value to participants, and the move by state legislatures to vote more rigorous controls of the out-of-state programs and emerging IHEs.

Much of what happens in the immediate future in California will depend upon the agreements worked out in the local school districts and regions. Presently, there are many districts in the state with guidelines and policies to govern credit from external degree programs and the use of the credit for salary increments. As expected, some are stronger than others and some are applied more thoroughly than others. There are some examples of consortium efforts where several districts and/or IHEs have developed a common set of guidelines. Some of these group plans are by counties or ACSA regions. Any district or association, therefore, that has no approved procedure can obtain numerous samples for the development of a policy.

Regardless of official agreements, however, there still will be the Educational Institute from Ionia, Oxville College from Iowa, the new independent University of Palm Springs, or the Continuing Education Office from State U. that will come into the district with much publicity about a special program to answer the needs of inservice personnel. The advance publicity very well could include such promises as innovative, flexible, job-centered, practical, self-paced, and personally meaningful. And the promises might turn out to be true.

However, there also is the chance that the agent is a head hunter with more interest in enrollment figures than educational depth. What should be done? If there is a local set of guidelines and a committee or process for assessing potential, each proposed course or workshop can be judged on the basis of the assignments required of the enrollees, the competence of the instructor and the value of the instructional strategies used. If a given course differs markedly from its counterpart on campus, its acceptability for degree and transfer credit should be brought in line with campus standards. Without guidelines and procedures, a local district is at the mercy of the inservice purveyors. With criteria, some proposals can be rejected.

If the IHE, broker or agent is relatively unknown, the district can collect helpful information quickly by contacting the OPPE or WASC where records are kept on the approval and accreditation status of all institutions operating in California. Checks also can be made with districts where the institutions have offered courses previously. The data now available about external offerings precludes the need for districts and associations to be surprised or individual school personnel to be disappointed.

Until many of the problems about external degree programs are resolved, local education agencies may wish to implement ACSA's suggested guidelines for approving off-campus credit for inservice training. The guidelines were published in 1977 in a MAP paper.[1] A district using the guidelines, which are reproduced below, will take a definite step forward in controlling the quality of off-campus inservice programs.

Plans and Policies for Credit Courses

The local education agency has responsibility to define needs, establish priorities, implement new programs, and set standards for the use of appropriate resources needed for professional development. Therefore, ACSA recommends that investment in inservice education serves two major needs: (1) the professional development of district employees and (2) the improvement of education.

A. Purpose

The purpose of this plan and policy statement is:

1. To promote the establishment of continuing education and extension courses for the improvement of instruction through the cooperative efforts of the college, the university, the county schools office, and the school district.
2. To establish standards for credit courses.

[1] ACSA Higher Education Committee (Lewie Burnett, Chairperson), "Plans and Policies for Credit Courses," MAP, Vol. 7, No. 1 (Dec., 1977).

B. Guidelines

1. Policy

The school district should adopt policy to provide for the evaluation of acceptable in-service credit. This policy should provide for relevancy to professional development in a specific assignment as a qualification for an employee's salary increment. Credit will be accepted only from institutions of higher education approved through WASC and/or the California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing.

2. Needs Assessment

Programs of in-service education will be based on the assessed needs of school students, educational personnel, and school programs.

3. Self-Development

Self-development by the individual in accepting the responsibility for his/her own growth and continuous progress is encouraged.

4. Personalized In-service

The local education agency is encouraged to recognize that individual needs vary; therefore, a variety of approved growth activities is recommended.

5. Resources

Human, physical and financial resources may be shared by participating agencies (districts, universities, county schools, and the state) for staff development.

C. College and University Credit Courses Offered Through Extension

1. Time Standards
In-class

One quarter unit of credit may be offered for 10 class hours of instruction. One semester unit may be offered for 15 class hours of instruction.

Out-of-class

The student will engage in approximately two hours of student effort for each hour of class time.

2. Course Approval

A proposal for an extension course, submitted by a district or a county schools office, shall be approved by both the local education agency and the agency or institution offering the course. The following will be required for every course offered:

a. Course purposes and objectives.
b. Outline of course content.
c. Indicate how class time will be allocated. Show activities planned.
d. Required activities for student learning.
e. Basis of student evaluation (tests, term paper, project).
f. Bibliography.
g. Biographical information on the instructor, resource persons, etc.
h. Prior instructor evaluation.

3. Week-end Courses

Week-end courses shall follow the same standards as courses which may run for 10-15 weeks. However, no more than 1-1/2 quarter units or 1 semester unit may be earned on any one week-end. (See 1. above)

4. Instructors

The course offering institution should be a valid, written procedure for certifying the professional qualifications of instructors.

5. Evaluation

a. Students will formally (in writing) evaluate instruction at the close of each course. Results will be sent by a student monitor to the appropriate person at the institution giving the credit. The evaluation shall include appropriate individual student evaluation of the following: Organization of course, teaching skills, knowledge of subject matter, grading/evaluation, and relationship with students.

b. The instructor will evaluate student progress using methods appropriate to the content of the course, as: formal examinations, term paper, project, analysis of data, action research or development of materials.

"Special Reports" are intended to present information of a practical value to school administrators in California. It should be recognized that (a) the applicability and value of such information may vary from district to district in a state as diverse as California, and (b) articles herein printed are the expressions of the author(s) and are not necessarily statements of policy of the Association of California School Administrators.